GA 1.13: FPCD-81-55

BY THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Report To The Director Office Of Personnel Management

Evaluations Called For To Monitor And Assess Executive Appraisal Systems

One of the most important features of the Senior Executive Service is its requirement for objectives-based, results-oriented performance appraisal systems. The appraisal process will evaluate the performance of senior executives in the Federal Government and will provide a basis for making many executive personnel decisions, including monetary performance awards, development, advancement, and dismissals.

GAO administered Government-wide questionnaires to agencies and senior executives. Their responses were generally positive. However, some implementation and attitudinal problems did emerge.

GAO believes it is critical that agencies develop and implement formal evaluation systems to monitor and determine how valid, fair, and objective their appraisal processes are for making pay and other personnel decisions. The Office of Personnel Management should aid agencies in this effort by issuing additional guidelines and monitoring implementation of the evaluation systems.

FPCD-81-55
AUGUST 3, 1981

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are $3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are $1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-196181

The Honorable Donald J. Devine
Director, Office of Personnel
Management

Dear Dr. Devine:

The Senior Executive Service (SES) was designed to insure that the executive management of the United States is responsive to the needs, policies, and goals of the Nation and is of the highest quality. One of the most important features of the SES is its objectives-based, results-oriented performance appraisal requirement. The appraisal process is intended to evaluate the performance of senior executives and provide a basis for making many executive personnel decisions, including monetary performance awards, development, advancement, and dismissals.

In meeting our responsibility to review performance appraisal systems mandated by the Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA), we studied the progress and problems agencies are having in implementing SES performance appraisal systems and senior executives' perceptions toward those systems. While it is too early to judge the overall effectiveness of SES appraisal systems at this time, we wanted to identify existing or potential problems so agencies and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) can take corrective action.

Our study found that several important implementation procedures--pretesting, training, and establishing monitoring and evaluation systems--were either not used or used only to a limited extent by agencies. In addition, while perceptions of SES members were generally positive, SES members did identify areas which need attention by agencies and OPM. As a result of our study, we believe agencies need to implement formal evaluation systems to (1) monitor and assess the effectiveness of their SES performance appraisal processes and

(2) pin-point problems within their systems so that timely, corrective actions can be taken. We are making formal recommendations to the Director, OPM, to require that agencies develop and implement evaluation systems and that OPM provide guidance and followup to insure compliance. (See p. 13.)

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

To obtain a Government-wide profile of SES performance appraisal system implementation, we

--reviewed OPM guidelines, assistance to agencies, and evaluation efforts through interviews with appropriate OPM officials and reviewed appropriate records, publications, and written evaluation plans;

--issued a questionnaire to 53 agencies and agency subunits (see app. II, p. 21 for list of agencies and subunits) to obtain information about implementation status, processes, and system characteristics;

--issued a questionnaire to a scientifically selected sample of 2,085 senior executives to obtain their views about systems being implemented; and

--visited seven agencies to review system processes, interview appropriate officials, and review a limited sample of actual senior executive performance requirements. (The specific information obtained from site visits is not included in this report but was used to obtain background information and a better understanding of the processes agencies were using in implementing their appraisal systems.)

In addition, we reviewed literature on performance appraisal and examined title IV of CSRA and its legislative history.

The agencies we visited were the Department of Energy; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Department of the Army; Office of Personnel Management; Securities and Exchange Commission; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce. These agencies differed in size, function, and organizational makeup. Our work was centered at headquarters offices where most of the performance appraisal system development occurred.

Of the 53 agencies selected to receive questionnaires, each had 20 or more senior executive incumbents as of

December 31, 1979. These agencies included about 94 percent of the Government's 6,893 SES incumbents (as of December 31, 1979.) All agencies responded. Questionnaires were mailed May 8, 1980.

In addition, of the 2,085 executives sampled in our second questionnaire, 1,565 were from the seven agencies listed above, and 520 were randomly selected from throughout the Federal Government. The response rate was 83 percent. OPM's SES personnel data base, current as of December 31, 1979, was used to select questionnaire participants. Questionnaires were mailed June 12, 1980.

In November 1980, we conducted a telephone followup with the 53 agencies to obtain the current status of their performance appraisal system implementation.

Appendix I to this letter contains background information on SES, appendix II contains the agency questionnaire and responses, and appendix III contains the senior executive questionnaire and responses.

Following is a brief summary of the questionnaire results and some of the more important areas which we believe need OPM and agency attention.

SEVERAL IMPORTANT IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES ONLY MINIMALLY USED

The agency questionnaire results revealed that many of the procedures which experts say should be employed in establishing effective performance appraisal systems were not used or only minimally used when implementing SES performance appraisal systems. For example, most of the agencies did not test their systems before implementing them, did not establish specific plans for evaluating their systems, and did not thoroughly train users in the skills needed to effectively carry out the appraisal process. However, on the positive side, agencies apparently did try to involve users in developing their systems.

Most agencies did not pretest their systems

Pretesting is a generally accepted procedure for implementing an effective performance appraisal process. Of the 53 agencies sampled, 46, or 87 percent, did not pretest their performance appraisal systems before implementing them.

Private industry and State and local government's experience with objectives-based, pay-for-performance appraisal systems indicates that time and practice is needed to implement effective processes. For example, in our March 3, 1981, report on merit pay 1/, we reported results of our discussions with seven experts, three private companies, and three non-Federal government organizations about their experiences with pay-for-performance appraisal systems (similar to SES systems). All of them indicated it would take anywhere from 3 to 10 years to design, test, and establish effective systems, giving users time to develop skills and experience using the system before real decisions were made.

In our report on merit pay, we noted that both State and local government and private sector organizations found that at least several years experience through pretesting or previous use of objectives-based performance appraisal systems was very important to program success. These organizations found that, by pretesting,

--employees began to see the benefits of performance appraisal and developed more positive attitudes,

--supervisors learned to set and evaluate objectives before fully implementing the system, and

--management had the opportunity to study the system and fine tune it before involving all employees.

While testing is normally needed before a performance appraisal system begins to operate smoothly and reliably, few agencies included in our study had the opportunity to pretest their systems. Federal agencies were given less than a year after passage of CSRA to begin using their SES systems. Many of the 53 agencies surveyed did not meet OPM's implementation milestones, although most systems were eventually put into use during fiscal year 1980. As a result, the first few years of SES performance appraisal implementation will be experimental. Our work has already revealed some of the difficulties agencies can expect to encounter. This is

---

1/"Federal Merit Pay: Important Concerns Need Attention" (FPCD-81-9). Merit pay is a pay system for Federal employees in grades GS-13 to GS-15 and is designed to improve performance by linking it to pay increases. Merit pay systems, mandated by CSRA, are to be implemented by Federal agencies by October 1981.

not to say, however, that agencies have not tried to implement good systems. We believe most are taking the challenge seriously. Agencies, however, can improve their systems through monitoring and evaluating their appraisal processes to insure that problems are identified early so that corrective actions can be taken.

Need for monitoring and evaluation of systems

According to OPM and other experts, a rigorous evaluation process is a key ingredient to a high quality performance appraisal system. At the time of our survey, less than half (25) of the agencies had established formal plans to evaluate their SES performance systems, although 20 agencies indicated evaluation plans would be established by the end of fiscal year 1981.

Monitoring and evaluation plans should be designed to assess whether the performance appraisal system is contributing to improved organizational effectiveness; is accepted by users; and meets tests of validity, precision, and reliability. Validity is the degree to which an appraisal instrument actually measures job performance. Precision is the degree to which systems are able to discriminate between differences in individual performance, and reliability refers to agreement among raters evaluating the same ratee. In addition, evaluations should determine whether systems are too complicated or take excessive amounts of users' time. Ideally, monitoring and evaluation should begin in the pretesting phase and should continue throughout the life of the performance appraisal system.

Need for additional training

Responses to our questionnaire indicated that many agencies did not thoroughly train users in the skills needed to effectively use SES performance appraisal systems before implementation. Research has shown that, regardless of how well the system is designed, if supervisors are unskilled in administering performance appraisals, the system is not likely to work effectively.

According to OPM and other experts, supervisors should know not only how the system is supposed to work, they should also be skilled in (1) helping subordinates develop clear, meaningful, job-related performance goals and standards, (2) appraising performance in a fair, accurate, and unbiased manner, (3) communicating their appraisals to subordinates

in an open, direct manner and in an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, and (4) recognizing when and how to give performance counseling. Supervisors also need to view the performance appraisal as a useful management tool and an integral part of their management responsibilities. Otherwise, they may see performance appraisal as nothing more than burdensome paperwork.

As of October 1979--the date systems were to be fully implemented--training had been given in the 53 agencies we surveyed as follows:

--35 agencies (66%) had given training to all their senior executives in policies and procedures of their performance appraisal systems, 5 (9%) to some but not all of their senior executives, and 13 (25%) had given it to none.

--32 agencies (60%) had given training to all executives in developing performance objectives, 9 (17%) to some but not all of their executives, and 12 (23%) had given it to none.

--24 agencies (45%) had given training in performance appraisal skills (how to appraise) to all their executives, 6 (11%) to some but not all of their executives, 18 (34%) had given it to none, and 5 (9%) did not know how many of their executives received this training.

--16 agencies (30%) had given training in performance coaching and counseling skills to all their executives, 11 (21%) to some but not all of their executives, 22 (42%) had given it to none, and 4 (7%) did not know how many executives received this training.

In total, only 14 agencies had given training to all their senior executives in all 4 of these important areas. Furthermore, only 28 had planned to give training in all these areas by October 1980 when the first performance ratings were due. Agencies gave various reasons for not providing training--excessive demands on executives' time; insufficient calendar time; and, to a lesser extent, budget limitations.

Almost half of the senior executives responding to our questionnaire indicated they would like to have more training in each of the four performance appraisal areas. Furthermore, over half (55%) indicated they had difficulty developing performance requirements, and almost two-thirds (63%) reported their system was difficult to use.

Most of the agencies surveyed indicated they would eventually provide additional training to more of their executives, but that the training would probably be limited to a day or less. We do not know whether this additional amount of training will be adequate.

Senior executives' participation in system development appears reasonable

Users' participation in developing performance appraisal policies and processes helps to develop positive attitudes toward the system. Research has shown that users are more committed to an appraisal system if they participate in its design, in contrast to having a system imposed on them from their personnel office or an outside consultant.

All 53 agencies responding to our survey indicated that senior executives at the headquarters level were involved in system design; 45 reported that their senior executives were involved to a moderate or great extent. Paid external consultants were involved to a moderate or great extent in only 6 agencies and not involved in 39 agencies. Fifty-two percent of the senior executives responding said they participated in developing their system at least to a minimal extent, about 35 percent to some extent or more, and 22 percent to a moderate or great extent.

However, according to the 53 agencies responding to our questionnaire, senior executives at regional or field locations did not have as much participation as headquarters executives. Of the 37 agencies with field-located executives, 16 reported that their executives were involved to a moderate or great extent and 33 reported at least a minimal involvement.

It is difficult to say what extent of participation is satisfactory. There is an obvious practical limit as to how many and to what extent senior executives should participate. However, most agencies apparently have tried to involve senior executives in the development process.

SENIOR EXECUTIVES' ATTITUDES GENERALLY POSITIVE, BUT MIXED

User acceptance is important to the success of a performance appraisal system. We administered a Government-wide questionnaire to SES members to get their views about their performance appraisal systems. SES members' views provide a useful check on how systems are working and reveal problem

areas which may need attention, as well as good aspects of systems which can be useful information to senior agency management.

In response to our questionnaire, approximately five out of every eight senior executives said they supported their agency's SES performance appraisal system, and about half thought senior executives as a whole supported it. In addition, about two-thirds believed the requirement to set specific performance objectives and the opportunity to receive performance feedback would contribute to improved senior executive performance; about three out of five believed opportunities for bonuses and Presidential rank awards would also contribute to improved performance. A slightly smaller percentage, but over half, believed setting performance objectives and opportunities for feedback and rewards would motivate them.

On the basis of these responses, it appears that performance appraisal has gotten off to a reasonably good start in SES--at least a majority of executives see value in the appraisal process, which is a positive note. However, other responses indicate the receptiveness to the processes may be somewhat tentative.

About 36 percent of the SES executives who responded to our questionnaire were indifferent to, against, or had no opinion about supporting their agency's system. Similarly, about one-third responded that setting objectives and receiving performance feedback would not likely improve performance; and almost 40 percent responded that bonuses and rank awards were not likely to improve performance. Moreover, less than half believed their system would have an overall positive effect on their own performance.

Responses to questions about morale were fairly mixed, but with a slight tilt toward the negative. Forty-one percent believed their appraisal system would negatively affect SES morale, 27 percent believed it would have a positive effect, 17 percent no effect, and 15 percent had no opinion. On the other hand, about 32 percent felt that their agency's SES performance appraisal process would positively affect their own morale, while about 29 percent felt it would have a negative effect, 23 percent felt it would have no effect, and 16 percent had no opinion. In addition, only a little more than one-third of the SES members perceived strong top management support for systems.

In general, senior executives believed their performance ratings would be influenced either moderately or strongly by actual performance on the job. However, a fairly large segment also believed several political factors would influence the ratings. For example, over half believed personal relationships with influential persons would have a moderate to strong influence on ratings, and over a third believed that philosophical beliefs coinciding with the current Presidential Administration would influence ratings.

On the basis of voluntary comments written by senior executives in our questionnaires, some of the reasons given for not fully supporting their agency's performance appraisal system and for the decline in morale include the following:

--The appraisal process is a distraction forced on them which makes their jobs more difficult.

--Their performance appraisal system is not designed well.

--Their system cannot work in a bureaucratic environment.

--Their system will require them to step up bureaucratic gamesmanship.

--External politics will prevent delivery of a bonus program to the extent originally promised to SES as an inducement to join.

--Internal politics, favoritism, and pay compression problems will prevent the rating process from working honestly and fairly.

According to OPM and other experts, a critical ingredient to successfully implementing a performance appraisal system is to have strong support from top management. Only 37 percent of senior executives believed the top executives of their agencies strongly supported their SES performance appraisal system, although another 29 percent perceived mild support.

In addition to senior executives' perceptions, our survey of 53 agencies also revealed potential shortcomings in top management commitment. Only 36 agencies claimed their

top executives strongly supported the system, while another 9 reported mild support. The rest reported top executives were indifferent, mildly against the system, or gave no opinion.

AGENCIES HAVE PROBLEMS ESTABLISHING PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

Establishing performance requirements for senior executives before the beginning of the rating period is a problem for many agencies. Our work indicates that agencies experienced this problem in their first and second round of ratings.

CSRA requires that performance requirements for senior executives be established on or before the beginning of the rating period. Of the 53 agencies we surveyed, 12 had performance objectives and critical job elements established and communicated to all their senior executives by OPM's October 1979 deadline. However, 18 of the agencies had not established performance objectives for any of their executives as of October 1979. The remaining 23 agencies had established performance objectives and critical job elements for some of their executives but not for all. As a result, objectives for many executives were not set until well into the rating period for which their objectives applied. Lack of sufficient resources, difficulty in establishing performance objectives, and unrealistic time frames were cited as reasons for missing the deadline.

A telephone followup with the 53 agencies in November 1980 indicated that many continued to have problems in setting performance objectives for senior executives for the second rating period. Only three agencies reported that performance requirements for all executives had been established at the beginning of the second performance appraisal period. Eighteen reported requirements in place for some of their executives, with only four having them in place for more than half their executives. In addition, 18 had not established them for any of their executives, and 13 were uncertain of the status. One agency had not completed the first rating period.

OPM GUIDANCE, ASSISTANCE, AND MONITORING ROLE

Although most of the agencies responding to our questionnaire indicated they received adequate assistance from OPM and did not want more OPM guidance when implementing their performance appraisal systems, a substantial segment

would have liked more assistance. Of the 53 agencies surveyed, 33 (62%) said they received as much guidance as needed or desired, and 29 (55%) said it was timely. Sixteen (30%) received guidance but would have preferred more, and 21 (40%) said the guidance was usually provided later than needed.

CSRA requires OPM to establish standards and regulations for SES performance appraisal systems and to review each agency's system to determine if it meets requirements of the act. To date, OPM has engaged in a number of activities to provide general performance appraisal guidance and information to agencies and to monitor agencies' progress in implementing SES systems. However, it has established only limited standards and no regulations, and has not critiqued the quality of system processes being implemented.

According to OPM program officials, OPM has not taken a more direct role because

--CSRA encourages decentralization of personnel management decisions and gives agencies primary responsibility for designing and implementing their systems;

--CSRA gives fairly detailed specifications for systems, and this precludes the need for immediate regulations;

--the state-of-the-art of performance appraisal is such that there is not available anywhere a single best system which OPM could recommend;

--organizational activity and environment is so diverse in the Federal sector that agencies needed flexibility to develop systems tailored to their individual needs; and

--they wanted to encourage innovation and wait until they could see which agency approaches were working best and what problems emerged before requiring specific measures.

OPM's efforts to date have been primarily oriented toward monitoring implementation status and gathering information for assessing overall progress in implementing SES. Efforts directed specifically to SES systems include

--reviews of SES performance appraisal system plans to determine if the systems conform to CSRA;

--case studies over a 5-year period at four Government agencies to examine the overall effect of several CSRA provisions, including SES;

--onsite progress reviews to monitor agencies' implementation of SES and compliance with CSRA provisions--a portion of each review focuses on SES performance appraisal implementation; and

--a special study in April 1980 on SES performance appraisal, covering 54 agencies (containing more than 90% of SES positions), which highlighted agencies' progress and strategies in designing and developing their appraisal systems.

According to OPM officials, these efforts included little critiquing of appraisal system quality and feedback and few recommendations to agencies for improving systems. However, they informed us that OPM intends to take a more active role in monitoring the quality of agencies' systems and their implementation procedures.

CONCLUSIONS

Non-Federal experience shows that pretesting, user training, evaluation of systems, and several years of development are important steps to implementing successful performance appraisal systems. Since many agencies did not follow these steps in implementing their SES systems, the first few years in operation will be experimental. As a result, agencies need to develop and implement formal evaluation systems to monitor and assess the effectiveness of their SES performance appraisal processes as soon as possible to insure that they are valid, fair, and objective. Unless a reliable and timely method exists for evaluating and monitoring appraisal systems, areas which need attention, change, or improvement cannot be effectively identified. On the basis of our questionnaire results, agencies need to address areas such as training, establishing performance requirements, and obtaining top management commitment to the SES appraisal process.

While the results of our study should only be viewed as early observations and not as conclusive evidence about the quality of systems or likelihood of their success, they do signal areas for agencies, OPM, and the Congress to be concerned about as SES performance appraisal systems continue in operation. Agencies still have time to correct their performance appraisal systems before problems become too difficult to overcome. User acceptance is very important to

successful implementation of performance appraisal systems, and agencies should continue to obtain feedback from SES members to monitor problems they may be experiencing. The questionnaire results in appendixes II and III can help agencies identify problem areas and can serve as the basis for future evaluations of their systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the Director, OPM:

--Require agencies to establish and implement comprehensive evaluation and monitoring systems for their SES performance appraisal processes.

--Issue minimum standards and requirements which should be included in all evaluation systems implemented by agencies.

--Provide guidelines to agencies on how to establish and implement an effective evaluation process.

--Follow up with agencies to insure that evaluation systems are being properly and effectively implemented.

As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement of actions taken on our recommendations. This written statement must be submitted to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Government Operations not later than 60 days after the date of the report. A written statement must also be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with an agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report.

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the head of each agency involved in our review.

Sincerely yours,

Clifford I. Gould

Clifford I. Gould
Director

Blank Page

APPENDIX I

SES BACKGROUND

Passage of CSRA of 1978 (Public Law 95-454) marked a new era in the management of the Federal work force. Recognizing that the quality of the Federal civil service depends greatly on the quality and motivation of its senior leadership, CSRA established a new comprehensive personnel system for executives--SES--which is designed to

--provide better management of the number and distribution of Federal executives,

--give agency managers greater flexibility in assigning executives where they are most needed,

--insure that career people entering SES have managerial qualifications,

--make executives individually accountable for their performance,

--permit removal of those whose performance is less than fully successful and does not show improvement,

--link compensation with performance,

--offer increased advancement opportunities to career executives, and

--simplify the numerous pay and other laws previously governing senior executive levels.

SES went into effect on July 13, 1979, when nearly 7,000 eligible executives became members. It is a gradeless system where salary and status are personal and not dependent on the position one occupies.

SES STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

SES encompasses most of the managerial/supervisory positions in the executive branch formerly classifiable at General Schedule (GS)-16, 17, and 18 and Executive Levels IV and V (or their equivalents) that do not require Senate confirmation. Certain positions remain outside SES by statutory exclusion or by the President on recommendation from OPM.

Four types of appointments can occur under SES.

Career: Selection under the merit staffing process--OPM approves candidates' managerial qualifications.

Noncareer: Selection not under the merit staffing process--OPM does not review candidates' managerial qualifications.

Limited term: Nonrenewable appointment to a position whose duties expire within 3 years.

Limited emergency: Nonrenewable appointment for up to 18 months to meet an urgent need.

CSRA requires five or more SES pay rates. The President established six levels of pay--Executive Schedule (ES)-1 (lowest) through ES-6 (highest).

CSRA established an overall limit of 10,777 SES positions plus non-SES GS supergrade positions. The size of SES for each agency is based on program needs. OPM allocates SES positions to each agency for a 2-year period. As of December 31, 1980, agencies had established 8,324 SES positions and had filled 7,042 with senior executives, including 6,411 career-designated senior executives.

Career executives in SES with fully successful performance ratings can receive lump-sum performance awards (bonuses) of up to 20 percent of their base pay. CSRA limits the number of awards granted in any fiscal year to 50 percent of all SES positions in an agency. However, concerned about potential abuses, the Congress passed subsequent legislation which limited the number of awards to 25 percent of positions for fiscal years 1980 and 1981 awards. OPM further limited bonuses in each year to 20 percent of the eligible career employees. Career executives are also eligible for Meritorious Executive and Distinguished Executive ranks:

--Meritorious Executive ranks can be awarded to a maximum of 5 percent of SES each year and have a lump-sum award of $10,000.

--Distinguished Executive ranks can be awarded to a maximum of 1 percent of the SES each year and have a lump-sum award of $20,000.

CSRA also requires each agency to develop, according to OPM standards, one or more SES performance appraisal systems designed to

--permit accurate evaluation of performance on the basis of criteria which specify a position's critical elements,

--provide for systematic appraisals of performance,

--encourage excellence in performance, and

--provide a basis for determining eligibility for retention and for performance awards.

Each system must be reviewed and approved by OPM.

SES performance appraisal

The performance appraisal process is one of the most important aspects of SES. Because SES performance appraisal systems will be the basis for making most executive personnel decisions, including monetary performance awards, assignments, development, advancement, and dismissals, they are the cornerstone of CSRA's goal of improving Federal management and productivity.

CSRA is specific in requiring that certain features and procedures be incorporated in all systems. For example, CSRA requires that each senior executive's performance be appraised and rated at least once a year on the basis of individual and organizational objectives established at the beginning of a rating period. The process for setting these performance requirements and objectives is required to be a collaborative effort between the executive and supervisor. Areas of performance measurement outlined in CSRA include productivity, quality of work, timeliness of performance, cost efficiency, and progress in meeting affirmative action goals.

Assessment of an executive's progress in meeting the defined performance requirements is made initially by the supervisor, with subsequent evaluation by performance review boards (PRBs) within the agency. These PRBs, according to OPM guidance,

--review and evaluate the initial appraisal and rating by the senior executive's supervisors; the senior executive's written response, if any; and the written review of the initial appraisal by a higher-level executive, if such a review was made;

--can have a continuing monitoring function designed to improve and strengthen the entire performance appraisal system;

--should make a written recommendation concerning an executive's appraisal and rating; and

--are also responsible for making recommendations to the appointing authority concerning individual awards to be granted to fully successful career appointees.

By law, agency performance appraisal systems must provide for at least three levels of competence: fully successful, minimally satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. SES executives

with ratings of "fully successful" or above are eligible for performance awards. A "minimally satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" rating can result in removal from SES.

An important change stimulated by CSRA was to delegate greater responsibility to agencies in personnel administration. In accordance with this concept the act gave each agency primary responsibility for developing one or more SES performance appraisal systems, subject to standards and regulations established by OPM. CSRA requires OPM to review systems to determine if they meet provisions of the act and to take corrective actions as required. Thus, even though agencies are delegated responsibilities for developing systems, it is OPM's responsibility to provide them guidance, monitor their progress, and insure they are implementing effective systems.

Implementation time frames

Federal agencies were given less than a year by OPM to design and implement SES performance appraisal systems. CSRA became law in October 1978, and on February 5, 1979, OPM issued a special bulletin to agencies setting out several milestones for SES appraisal implementation. It gave agencies until May 1, 1979, to submit a performance appraisal plan to it for approval--3 months after the bulletin was issued and 7 months after CSRA was passed. The bulletin also required agencies to establish, by October 1979, organizational and personnel goals, performance standards, and critical elements for each SES position, and to formally communicate them to incumbents. In effect, this required agencies to begin the appraisal process in 8 months, or just a year after passage of CSRA. During this time frame, agencies were also burdened with the need to convert their executives to SES and put SES into operation by CSRA's July 13, 1979, deadline. Finally, the bulletin required agencies to complete their first SES performance ratings no later than October 1980. CSRA did not specify SES performance appraisal milestones other than the requirement for executives to be rated at least once a year.

APPENDIX II

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO 53 AGENCIES

This appendix contains the questions and response rates of the questionnaire we distributed to 53 agency heads. The questionnaire format in this appendix is altered slightly from the one mailed to the agencies in order to provide space for displaying responses.

It was not appropriate for all agencies to answer some questions because of answers to other questions. The number of agencies is usually indicated in each question by "n=," followed by the number of agencies; for example, n=53, or n=46. Percentages for responses do not always add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding.

APPENDIX II

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Survey Of Senior Executive Service
Performance Appraisal Systems

Please keep in mind these questions refer only to your agency's SES performance appraisal system and not to its Merit Pay or other appraisal systems.

In answering this questionnaire, Please use the following definitions:

Performance appraisal system--refers to the entire process of establishing senior executive performance objectives; conducting performance reviews and appraisals; recommending ratings, rewards, and other actions; and determining final performance ratings.

Your agency--is the organizational unit to which you belong and that is responsible for designing a distinct SES performance appraisal system. For example, bureaus in the Department of Commerce have designed eleven distinct SES performance appraisal systems under general Departmental guidelines. Consequently, if you worked for the Department of Commerce, when this questionnaire refers to "your agency" it is referring to the particular bureau for which you work. However, if you work at an agency or department with only one SES performance appraisal system (like NASA or the Department of Energy), "your agency" refers to the entire governmental agency or department.

Performance objectives--refer to the goals or performance factors against which an executive's performance will be measured at the end of an appraisal period. Agency's have referred to these by such terms as performance requirements, performance standards, or performance plans.

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information on the status of development and implementation of your agency's Senior Executive Service (SES) performance appraisal system. Although the SES concept has been in effect for only a short time, the information you provide can help it to better serve your needs and those of the entire Government.

You may not need to answer every question. Instructions have been provided throughout the questionnaire to branch you around questions which will not apply to your agency. Thus, you will see statements such as "Go To Question 7" indicating which question you should answer next.

Most of the questions can be answered by circling the number printed beside the appropriate answer. These numbers are for keypunching purposes only. For example:

1
2
3

To answer some questions you may have to contact others in your agency or consult various records and files. We encourage you to do this in order that the most accurate information possible is provided.

APPENDIX II

SECTION A GENERAL

A1. Please print your name, title, and phone number.

_____
NAME

_____
TITLE

_____

_____
TELEPHONE

A2. Please print your agency's name and your location.

_____
AGENCY

_____
LOCATION (CITY, STATE OR WASHINGTON, D.C.)

_____

FIFTY-THREE AGENCIES AND AGENCY SUBUNITS RESPONDING

Department of Agriculture
Civil Aeronautics Board
Department of Commerce
- Office of the Secretary
- Office of the Chief Economist
- Bureau of the Census
- Economic Development Administration
- International Trade Administration
- Maritime Administration
- National Bureau of Standards
- National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
- Patent and Trademark Office

Department of Defense
- Office of the Secretary
- Department of the Air Force
- Department of the Army
- Department of the Navy

Department of Education
Department of Energy
Environmental Protection Agency
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Federal Communications Commission
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Federal Trade Commission
General Services Administration
Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of the Secretary and other
- Food and Drug Administration
- Health Care Financing Administration

APPENDIX II

National Institute of Health-Extramural Scientists
National Institute of Health-Intramural Scientists
Office of the Assistant Secretary Health/Health Services Administration
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Department of the Interior
U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency
Interstate Commerce Commission
Department of Justice
Departmental System
Immigration and Naturalization Service
Department of Labor
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
National Labor Relations Board
National Science Foundation
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Management and Budget
Office of Personnel Management
Securities and Exchange Commission
Small Business Administration
Department of State
Department of the Transportation
Department of Treasury
Office of the Secretary
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency
Office of the General Counsel
Internal Revenue Service
U.S. Customs Service
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Veterans Administration

A3. For your Agency, please give the number of SES personnel actually on board in each category as of April 1, 1980:

	Headquarters	Field
Career	_____	_____
Non-Career	_____	_____
Limited Emergency	_____	_____
Limited Term	_____	_____

TOTAL REPORTED

Appointment type	Headquarters	Field	Totals
Career	4,059	1,746	5,805
Non-Career	431	68	499
Limited Emergency	10	0	10
Limited Term	47	0	47
Total	4,547	1,814	6,361

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

Number of Senior Executives	Career in headquarters: Number of agencies	Career in headquarters: Percent of agencies	Career in field: Number of agencies	Career in field: Percent of agencies
0	1	1.9	16	30.2
1-19	8	15.1	19	35.8
20-49	16	30.2	8	15.1
50-99	14	26.4	3	5.7
100-199	10	18.9	5	9.4
200-299	3	5.7	2	3.8
300-399	0	0.0	0	0.0
400-499	1	1.9	0	0.0
Total	53		53	100.0

Noncareer, headquarters			Noncareer, field	
Number of Senior Executives	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies
0	10	18.9	43	81.1
1-19	35	66.0	10	18.9
20-49	8	15.1	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-
100-199	-	-	-	-
200-299	-	-	-	-
300-399	-	-	-	-
400-499	-	-	-	-
Total	53	100.0	53	100.0

Limited emergency, headquarters			Limited emergency, field	
Number of Senior Executives	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies
0	48	90.6	53	100.0
1-19	5	9.4	-	-
	53	100.0	53	100.0

Limited term headquarters			Limited term field	
Number of Senior Executives	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies
0	42	79.2	53	100.0
1-19	11	20.8	-	-
	53	100.0	53	100.0

A4. Please supply the dates on which each of the following events occurred or are anticipated in the design and implementation of your agency's SES performance appraisal system. Use the initials "ND" if the date on which the event will occur has not been determined yet. Use "NK" if not known.

	mo/yr
Date system design began	_____
Date system design completed	_____
Date system plan submitted to OPM for approval	_____
Date system plan approved by OPM	_____
Date first rating period began	_____
Date first SES bonuses were or plan to be paid	_____

APPENDIX II

FREQENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

Date System Design Began

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
4/78	1	1.9	2/79	5	9.4
8/78	1	1.9	3/79	8	15.1
10/78	2	3.8	4/79	5	9.4
11/78	8	15.1	5/79	1	1.9
12/78	5	9.4	6/79	2	3.8
1/79	10	18.9	9/79	1	1.9
			3/80	1	1.9
			No answer	3	5.7
	27			26	

Date System Design Completed

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
11/78	1	1.9	7/79	5	9.4
1/79	1	1.9	8/79	7	13.2
3/79	1	1.9	9/79	3	5.7
4/79	9	17.0	10/79	1	1.9
5/79	9	17.0	12/79	1	1.9
6/79	9	17.0	5/80	1	1.9
			6/80	1	1.9
			No answer	4	7.5
	30			23	

Date Plan Submitted to OPM

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
4/79	5	9.4	9/79	3	5.7
5/79	12	22.6	11/79	1	1.9
6/79	11	20.8	12/79	1	1.9
7/79	7	13.2	4/80	1	1.9
8/79	4	7.5	7/80	1	1.9
			No answer	7	13.2
	39			14	

Date Plan Approved by OPM

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
5/79	4	7.5	9/79	9	17.0
6/79	5	9.4	10/79	6	11.3
7/79	3	5.7	12/79	2	3.8
8/79	13	24.5	1/80	2	3.8
			7/80	1	1.9
			No answer	8	15.1
	25			28	

APPENDIX II

Date Plan Approved by OPM

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
5/79	4	7.5	9/79	9	17.0
6/79	5	9.4	10/79	6	11.3
7/79	3	5.7	12/79	2	3.8
8/79	13	24.5	1/80	2	3.8
			7/80	1	1.9
			No answer	8	15.1
	25			28	

Date First Rating Period Began

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
7/79	5	9.4	2/80	1	1.9
10/79	33	62.2	3/80	1	1.9
11/79	1	1.9	4/80	2	3.8
12/79	1	1.9	5/80	1	1.9
1/80	6	11.3	7/80	1	1.9
			10/80	1	1.9
	46			7	100.0

Date First SES Bonuses Were or Plan to be Paid

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
4/80	1	1.9	10/80	20	37.7
5/80	1	1.9	11/80	1	1.9
7/80	2	3.8	12/80	12	22.6
8/80	3	5.7	1/81	7	13.2
9/80	3	5.7	9/81	1	1.9
			No answer	2	3.8
	10			43	

A5. Was your performance appraisal system formally pre-tested? (For example, conducting an appraisal process on a trial basis)

	Number responding	Percent
____ Yes	7	13.2
____ No	46	86.8
	53	100.0

A7. To what extent did the following factors cause your agency to miss the May 1, 1979 deadline?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent
		Percent responding				
28	A. Too little time (unrealistic timeframe)	64.3	14.3	14.3	-	7.1
28	B. Lack of agency resources	21.4	10.7	28.6	10.7	28.6
28	C. Lack of timely guidance from OPM	3.6	10.7	35.7	21.4	28.6
28	D. Lack of priority within your agency	10.7	3.6	10.7	14.3	60.7
28	E. Other, please specify	14.3	3.6	3.6	-	78.6

A8. Please indicate a deadline date that, in your opinion, would have allowed adequate time.

Month Year

Responses

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
6/79	9	17.0
7/79	6	11.3
8/79	2	3.8
9/79	4	7.5
10/79	2	3.8
1/80	1	1.9
6/80	1	1.9
No answer	28	52.8
	53	

A9. Will there be enough time to design and implement your SES performance appraisal system while meeting the October 1, 1980 deadline for performance rating?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Yes (Go to question A 11)	50	94.3
___ No	3	5.7
	53	100.0

A10. Please indicate a deadline date that, in your opinion, should allow adequate time.

Month Year

Responses

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
7/80	1	1.9
12/80	1	1.9
6/81	1	1.9
No answer	50	94.3
	53	100.0

A11. As of OPM's October 1979 deadline, what percentage of your agency's senior executives had performance objectives and critical job elements established and communicated to them in writing?

	Number responding	Percent
___ All (go to question A14)	12	22.6
___ About 3/4	12	22.6
___ About 1/2	5	9.4
___ About 1/4	4	7.5
___ None	18	34.0
___ No response	2	3.8
	53	100.0

A12. To what extent did the following factors cause your agency to miss the October 1979 deadline?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent
		Percent responding				
40	A. Too little time (unrealistic timeframe)	50.0	12.5	15.0	10.0	12.5
40	B. Difficulty of executives being able to establish objectives	7.5	20.0	30.0	17.5	25.0
40	C. Lack of agency resources	15.0	7.5	20.0	20.0	37.5
40	D. Lack of timely guidance from OPM	2.5	5.0	25.0	32.5	35.0
40	E. Lack of priority within your agency	5.0	2.5	22.5	17.5	52.5
39	F. Other, please specify	23.1	7.7	2.6	-	66.7

APPENDIX II

A13. By what date did or will all senior executives in your agency have approved critical job elements and performance objectives communicated to them in writing?

Month _____ Year _____

Responses (n=41)

mo/yr	Number responding	Percent	mo/yr	Number responding	Percent
10/79	2	4.9	4/80	6	14.6
11/79	1	2.4	5/80	6	14.6
12/79	5	12.2	6/80	7	17.1
1/80	4	9.8	7/80	2	4.9
2/80	2	4.9	10/80	1	2.4
3/80	4	9.8	12/80	1	2.4

A14. To what extent were the following involved in the design of your agency's SES performance system?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent	Don't know
53	A. Agency's personnel staff	73.6	15.1	9.4	1.9	-	-
53	B. Agency's senior executives at a headquarter- level other than those on the personnel staff	62.3	22.6	11.3	3.8		
46	C. Specifically, agency's senior executives at regional or field locations	15.2	19.6	26.1	10.9	26.1	2.2
53	D. OPM Staff	-	-	11.3	35.8	52.8	-
53	E. Paid external consultants	11.3	-	11.3	3.8	73.6	-
53	F. Non-paid external consultants (other than OPM)	1.9	-	1.9	7.5	88.7	-
53	G. Agency head, deputy or equivalent (commissioners, directors, etc.)	35.8	20.8	26.4	11.3	5.7	-

A15. To what extent did your agency adopt a performance appraisal system designed or used by each of the following?

n=		Fully adopted	Partially adopted	Not at all	Don't know
53	A. Another Federal agency	3.8	41.5	49.1	5.7
53	B. State or local government agency	-	-	94.3	5.7
53	C. Private sector organization	-	20.8	75.5	3.8
53	D. An external consultant	-	15.1	83.0	1.9

SECTION B SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

B1. Please indicate the extent to which the following are used as a basis to appraise senior executive performance.

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent applicable	Don't know
		Percent responding					
53	A. Personnel traits exhibited while performing work (For example, leadership, initiative, forcefulness reliability, etc.)	1.9	5.7	17.0	35.8	37.7	1.9
53	B. Behaviors used in working to meet objectives (For example, organizing work, delegating authority, motivating people, communicating effectively, etc.)	26.4	39.6	15.1	9.4	7.5	1.9
53	C. Whether or not objectives are met, without regard to behaviors used (For example, meeting deadlines, staying within budgets, quantity or quality of work, etc.)	86.8	11.3	1.9	-	-	-
53	D. Other, please specify	9.4	3.8	3.8	-	79.2	3.8

APPENDIX II

B2. To what extent will performance appraisal systems for the following employee groups be based on your agency's SES system?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	No extent	Not applicable	Don't know
		Percent responding					
53	A. Non-SES executives (GS-16 to 18, Executive level IV, V or equivalent)	58.5	3.8	7.5	5.7	15.1	9.4
53	B. "Merit Pay" employees	52.8	18.9	15.1	3.8	5.7	3.8
53	C. Other "professional" employees	18.9	22.6	22.6	5.7	11.3	18.9
53	D. "Non-professional" employees	13.2	9.4	39.6	9.4	11.3	17.0

B3. To what extent is a senior executive's performance in each of the following areas explicitly required to be included as a part of his or her performance objectives?

n=		Must be a critical job element	Must be included (but not a critical job element)	Recommended	Not recommended
		Percent Responding			
53	A. Evaluating subordinates	26.4	39.6	26.4	7.5
53	B. Performance coaching/ counseling of subordinates	17.0	30.2	41.5	11.3
53	C. Professional development of subordinates	22.6	32.1	35.8	9.4
53	D. Meeting affirmative action and EEO objectives	50.9	43.4	5.7	-

B4. As a matter of written policy, which of the following are intended uses of your agency's SES performance appraisal system? (Circle as many as apply)

		Number responding	Percent
A. ___	Give feedback to executives to help improve performance	49	92.5
B. ___	Identify developmental/ training needs	47	88.7
C. ___	Career counseling	35	66.0
D. ___	Determine pay rates	44	83.0
E. ___	Determine bonuses	53	100.0
F. ___	Determine meritorious and distinguished executive ranks recommendations	47	88.7
G. ___	Basis for negative personnel actions (removal from SES, demotion, etc.)	52	98.1
H. ___	Basis for positive personnel actions (promotions etc.)	44	83.0
I. ___	Other, please specify	2	3.8

B5. In general, will pay and bonus recommendations or decisions be discussed between a senior executive and his or her supervisor in the same session as performance improvement and/or development needs?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Yes	9	17.0
___ No	10	18.9
___ Will be the option of the supervisor and/or subordinate	25	47.2
___ Not determined	8	15.1
___ Don't know	1	1.9
	53	100.0

APPENDIX II

B6. How often are interim performance reviews between supervisors and subordinates required by your agency?

	Number responding	Percent
___ At least once a year	26	49.1
___ At least twice a year	11	20.8
___ At least three times a year	5	9.4
___ More than three times a year	1	1.9
___ Not required	2	3.8
___ As needed	8	15.1
___ Not yet determined	0	0.0
	53	

SECTION C--COST INFORMATION

Cost data is not included due to inconsistencies by agencies in reporting it. Many agencies did not provide figures for a number of the cost categories, and there was little consistency regarding which categories were reported. In our opinion, reporting the data would be incomplete and misleading about the cost of designing and implementing systems.

SECTION D TRAINING

D1. As of October 1, 1979, approximately what portion of senior executives in your agency received formal training in each of the following subjects? Do not include training received prior to 1978.

n=		About all	About 3/4	About 1/2	About 1/4	None	Don't know
		Percent responding					
53	A. Agency policies and procedures for performance appraisal in the SES	66.0	5.7	-	3.8	24.5	-
53	B. How to establish performance objectives	60.4	7.5	5.7	3.8	22.6	-
53	C. Development of performance appraisal skills (e.g. How to eliminate bias, etc.)	45.3	5.7	-	5.7	34.0	9.4
53	D. Performance counseling and coaching skills (e.g. communicating and establishing rapport	30.2	7.5	3.8	9.4	41.5	7.5

D2. Approximately what portion of senior executives will have received formal training in each of the following subjects by October 1, 1980?

n=		About all	About 3/4	About 1/2	About 1/4	None	Don't know
		Percent responding					
53	A. Agency policies and procedures for performance appraisal in the SES	88.7	5.7	-	3.8	-	1.9
53	B. How to establish performance objectives	83.0	7.5	1.9	5.7	-	1.9
53	C. Development of performance appraisal skills (e.g. How to eliminate bias, etc.)	67.9	5.7	1.9	3.8	9.4	11.3
53	D. Performance counseling and coaching skills (e.g. communicating and establishing rapport)	52.8	7.5	5.7	11.3	15.1	7.5

Note: If your agency either has not given or will not give training in the areas listed in D1 and D2 above by October 1, 1980, skip to Question D9.

D3. What will be the length of training provided to your senior executives by October 1, 1980 in each of the following subjects?

n=		4 hrs. or less	About 1 day	About 2 days	About 3-5 days	1-2 weeks	None provided
		Percent responding					
51	A. Agency policies and procedures for performance appraisal in the SES	68.6	21.6	9.8	-	-	-
51	B. How to establish performance objectives	45.1	39.2	13.7	2.0	-	-
51	C. Development of performance appraisal skills (e.g. How to eliminate bias, etc.)	56.9	13.7	13.7	-	-	15.7
51	D. Performance counseling and coaching skills (e.g. communicating and establishing rapport	56.9	11.8	11.8	-	-	19.6

D4. Would your agency have preferred to give more training?

n=52

	Number responding	Percent
___ Yes (Go to Question D5)	32	61.5
___ No (Go to Question D6)	20	38.5
	52	100.0

D5. What prevented more training?

n=32

	Number responding	Percent of 32 agencies
A. ___ Budget limitations	7	21.9
B. ___ Lack of time	22	68.8
C. ___ Executive availability	24	75.0
D. ___ Other, please specify	5	15.6

D6. To what extent were the following involved in the design of the training?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent
		Percent responding				
52	A. In-house staff	75.0	13.5	3.8	5.8	1.9
52	B. OPM staff	1.9	3.8	5.8	26.9	61.5
52	C. Paid external consultants (excluding OPM staff)	42.3	3.8	11.5	5.8	36.5
52	D. Non-paid external consultants (excluding OPM staff)	-	-	-	9.6	90.4

D7. To what extent were the following involved in conducting the training?

n=52		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent
52	A. In-house staff	59.6	11.5	17.3	9.6	1.9
52	B. OPM staff	1.9	3.8	11.5	11.5	71.2
52	C. Paid external consultants (excluding OPM staff)	44.2	1.9	13.5	3.8	36.5
52	D. Non-paid external consultants (excluding OPM staff)	-	-	-	1.9	98.1

APPENDIX II

D8. To what extent were the following used to provide training?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent
		Percent responding				
52	A. Internal seminars or classes	86.5	3.8	1.9	1.9	5.8
52	B. Tuition type external classes (American Management Association, college courses etc.)	-	1.9	1.9	9.6	86.5
52	C. OPM classes and development programs	-	3.8	7.7	23.1	65.4
52	D. Another Federal agency's classes (Non-OPM)	-	-	1.9	3.8	94.2
52	E. Other, please specify _____ _____ _____ _____	7.7	-	-	3.8	88.5

D9. Has your agency provided written guidance to its senior executives on the following aspects of performance appraisal?

n=		Percent responding	
		Yes	No
53	A. Agency policies and procedures for performance appraisal in the SES	98.1	1.9
53	B. How to establish performance objectives	98.1	1.9
53	C. Performance appraisal skills (e.g. How to eliminate bias, etc.)	58.5	41.5
53	D. Performance counseling and coaching skills (e.g. communicating and establishing rapport)	56.6	43.4

SECTION E BONUSES

E1. About what percent of career SES members will receive bonuses for fiscal year 1980 performance?

	Number responding	Percent
___ More than 50 percent	5	9.4
___ 50 percent	5	9.4
___ 25 to 49 percent	12	22.6
___ One to 24 percent	0	0.0
___ None	0	0.0
___ Undetermined at this time	31	58.5
	53	

E2. In subsequent fiscal years, about what percent of career SES members will receive bonuses?

	Number responding	Percent
___ More than 50 percent	3	5.7
___ 50 percent	4	7.5
___ 25 to 49 percent	11	20.8
___ One to 24 percent	0	0.0
___ None	0	0.0
___ Not determined at this time	35	66.0
	53	100.0

E3. To what extent are each of the following likely to be taken into account in determining how many or which executives will be awarded bonuses?

n=		Very great extent	Great extent	Moderate extent	Minimal extent	Not at all
		Percent responding				
53	A. The number of executives who excel	83.0	13.2	3.8	-	-
53	B. The bonus percentages we understand other agencies will be awarding	-	3.8	9.4	35.8	50.9
53	C. The desire to distribute bonuses to as many executives as possible	5.7	15.1	18.9	26.4	34.0
53	D. The opportunity to overcome the effects of pay compression	5.7	9.4	15.1	34.0	35.8
53	E. The possibility of reducing executive turnover	5.7	5.7	37.7	26.4	24.5
53	F. Other, please specify	11.3	1.9	-	-	86.8

E4. To what extent do you plan to use cash "incentive awards" for the following groups of senior executives as a substitute or supplement to bonuses?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Minimal extent	No extent	Not determined
		Percent responding				
53	A. For career executives not receiving bonuses	3.8	9.4	22.6	15.1	49.1
53	B. For career executives receiving bonuses	-	5.7	15.1	30.2	49.1
53	C. For non-career executives	15.1	22.6	1.9	11.3	49.1

E5. Indicate the amount of funding for SES bonuses and incentive awards included in your agency's fiscal year 1980 and 1981 budgets. If not a "line item" in the budget, please indicate the amount you expect to pay. Indicate "none" if none is budgeted and "ND" if not determined.

	FY 1980*	FY 1981*
Bonuses	$_____	$_____
Incentive awards	$_____	$_____
Bonuses as a percent of SES salaries	$_____	$_____

*Data provided by agencies for this question was incomplete; we therefore are not including the data.

E6. Does your agency have specific written criteria for directly linking bonus decisions to performance appraisal results (e.g. numerical scales of performance that are directly tied to various bonus amounts)?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Yes	24	45.3
___ No, but will be established	3	5.7
___ No, do not know if it will be established	13	24.5
___ No, do not intend to	13	24.5
	53	100.0

E7. As a policy, which supervisors of career senior executives can make bonus recommendations?

Percent responding	Number responding	Percent
___ All first line (immediate) supervisors	29	54.7
___ Only executives reporting to the agency head	9	17.0
___ Other, please specify_____	9	17.0
___ None (Go To Section F)	4	7.5
___ Not determined (Go To Section F)	2	3.8
___ Don't know (Go To Section F)	0	0.0
	53	100.0

APPENDIX II

E8. For those supervisors making bonus recommendations, how much control do they have over the bonuses their subordinates may receive?

n=48

	Number responding	Percent
___ If the supervisor recommends a bonus the subordinate will almost always receive it in the amount recommended	0	0.0
___ If the supervisor recommends a bonus the subordinate will almost always receive one, but not necessarily in the amount recommended	5	10.4
___ If the supervisor recommends a bonus the subordinate will not necessarily receive one	23	47.9
___ Other, please specify _____	9	18.8
___ Don't know	0	0.0
___ Not determined at this time	11	22.9
	48	100.0

APPENDIX II

SECTION F

Assistance From The Office of Personnel Management

F1. To what extent did your agency receive policy guidance from OPM - i.e. guidance regarding regulations, operating procedures, deadlines, and similar information communicated in bulletins, letters, or verbal conversations?

	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies
___ As much as we needed	25	47.2
___ A lot, but not as much as needed	4	7.5
___ A lot, however, we didn't request any	2	3.8
___ Some, but not as much as needed	12	22.6
___ Some, however, we didn't request any	5	9.4
___ None, although we asked for it	1	1.9
___ None, however, we didn't request any	1	1.9
___ No response	3	5.7
	53	100.0

F2. If you felt that additional policy guidance should have been provided by OPM please describe the effects of not having that guidance.

12 agencies, or 23 percent, responded

F3. How timely was OPM's policy guidance on SES performance appraisal?

	Number responding	Percent
___ It was always available when needed (Go To Question F6)	11	20.8
___ It was usually available when needed	18	34.0
___ It was usually later than needed	19	35.8
___ It was always later than needed	2	3.8
___ We never received any policy guidance	0	0.0
___ No Response	3	5.7
	53	100.1

F4. How did the timeliness of OPM policy guidance affect the implementation of your SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Caused no implementation delays	19	45.2
___ Caused moderate implementation delays	22	52.4
___ Caused extensive implementation delays	0	0.0
No response	1	2.4
	42	100.0

F5. How did the timeliness of OPM policy guidance affect the quality of your SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Did not affect the quality	33	78.6
Affected the quality somewhat because lateness caused us to rush our effort	8	19.0
___ Affected the quality considerably because lateness caused us to rush our effort	0	0.0
No response	1	2.4
	42	100.0

APPENDIX II

F6. To what extent are you aware of the technical assistance OPM offers in SES performance appraisal?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Great extent	26	49.1
___ Moderate extent	17	32.1
___ Minimal extent	6	11.3
___ No extent	2	3.8
No response	2	3.8
	53	

F7. To what extent did your agency receive the following kinds of technical assistance from OPM in establishing your SES performance appraisal system?

n=		As much as needed	A lot, but not as much as needed	Some, but not as much as needed	None, although we asked for it	None, but we didn't ask for any
		Percent responding				
50	A. Information on performance appraisal theory, do's and don't's, etc.	52.0	2.0	16.0	2.0	28.0
50	B. Opinions or critiques of your system	54.0	6.0	6.0	2.0	32.0
50	C. "Hands on" help in designing your system	10.0	-	4.0	2.0	84.0
50	D. Providing information about what other agencies were doing	50.0	2.0	26.0	8.0	14.0
50	E. Providing contact points for established successful systems (federal or private)	46.0	4.0	16.0	8.0	26.0
50	F. Providing formal training for system designers	20.0	-	14.0	-	66.0
50	G. Providing formal training for systems users	20.0	-	12.0	-	68.0

APPENDIX II

F7. (continued)

	As much as needed	A lot, but not as much as needed	Some, but not as much as needed	None, although we asked for it	None, but we didn't ask for any
50 H. Providing assistance on how to set up your own training program	24.0	-	6.0	2.0	68.0
50 I. Providing information on other training available	24.0	2.0	18.0	2.0	54.0

F8. What other technical assistance from OPM might have been helpful?

16 agencies, or 30.2 percent, responded

F9. As a whole, to what extent did OPM's technical assistance help in the development of your agency's SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ To a great extent	2	3.8
___ To a moderate extent	4	7.5
___ To some extent	34	64.2
___ To no extent	10	18.9
No response	3	5.7
	53	100.1

F10. As a whole, to what extent would additional OPM technical assistance have helped improve the quality of your SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ To no extent	20	37.7
___ To some extent	21	39.6
___ To a moderate extent	7	13.2
___ To a great extent	1	1.9
No response	4	7.5
	53	

SECTION G GENERAL

G1. How much support do you feel the top few executives in your agency give to the SES performance appraisal system?

	Number of agencies	Percent
___ Strong support	36	67.9
___ Mild support	9	17.0
___ Indifferent	2	3.8
___ Mildly against or apprehensive	3	5.7
___ Strongly against	0	0.0
___ Don't know/No opinion	2	3.8
No Response	1	1.9
	53	

G2. How much support do you feel the senior executives in your agency give to their SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Strong support	14	26.4
___ Mild support	22	41.5
___ Indifferent	3	5.7
___ Mildly against or apprehensive	6	11.3
___ Strongly against	0	0.0
___ Don't know	7	13.2
No response	1	1.9
	53	100.0

G3. Does your agency have a formal plan to evaluate the effectiveness or quality of your SES performance appraisal system?

	Number responding	Percent
___ Yes (Continue To Question G4)	25	47.2
___ Not now, but we will by the end of FY 80 (Go To Question G5)	7	13.2
___ Not now, but we will by the end of FY 81 (Go To Question G5)	13	24.5
___ Not now, and we don't intend to (Go To Question G5)	0	0.0
___ Not yet determined (Go To Question G5)	8	15.1
	53	100.0

G4. Who will be responsible for evaluating the quality or effectiveness of your SES performance appraisal system? Circle all that apply.

n=53

	Number Responding	Percent
A. Executive Resources Board	28	52.8
B. Performance Review Board	22	41.5
C. Inspector General/ Internal Audit	2	3.8
D. Personnel Office	19	35.8
E. Consultant	3	5.7
F. OPM	5	9.4
G. Other, please specify	13	24.5

G5. To what extent was a systematic job analysis done for each SES position to aid SES members in establishing their performance objectives? Circle all that apply.

n=53

	Number responding	Percent
A. ___ In great detail, for all	5	9.4
B. ___ In great detail, for most	5	9.4
C. ___ In great detail, for some	3	5.7
D. ___ In moderate detail, for all	8	15.1
E. ___ In moderate detail, for most	6	11.3
F. ___ In moderate detail, for some	10	18.9
G. ___ Not done for any	12	22.6
H. ___ Not done for most	6	11.3
I. ___ Not done for some	0	0.0

Please add any comments you may have concerning SES performance appraisals and the problems you've experienced or forsee in its implementation.

	Number responding	Percent
Responded	10	18.9
No response	43	81.1
	53	100.0

SENIOR EXECUTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

We mailed our questionnaire to a total of 2,085 of the 6,893 senior executives who were on OPM roles as of December 31, 1979. This total includes all senior executives of the 7 agencies we visited (1,565) and 520 randomly selected executives from the rest of the SES. We sampled all executives in the seven agencies in order to stratify responses for those agencies and use the information in our review. Also we wanted to find out if answers varied significantly among agencies with differing organizational character. (For the most part they didn't.)

We selected a sampling error goal of 95 percent confidence for the Government-wide projection so that the answers would be accurate to plus or minus 5 percent of the responses obtained. A random sample of 364 senior executives was needed from a 6,893 universe to meet this error rate. By selecting all senior executives whose social security number ended in a digit that was randomly selected, the Office of Personel Management selected the sample from its data base. This produced a sample of 520 executives from a universe which excluded the executives from the seven agencies.

The results from the random and one hundred percent samples were merged by multiplying a given response by a factor based on sample size and the percent of the overall population of the respondent's agency. In general, this gave more weight to the random sample since each response represented 12 senior executives. Unless otherwise indicated, information on the questionnaire analysis has been weighted and can be projected to the entire Senior Executive Service.

We mailed the 2,085 questionnaires on June 12, 1980. As of the cutoff date (60 days after our initial mailing) 1,554 questionnaires had been answered and returned. In addition, 217 questionnaires had been returned as undeliverable because of retirements, resignations, or transfers. These 217 questionnaires were subtracted from the number mailed in order to compute the following response data.

APPENDIX III

Agency	Questionnaires Sent	Undeliverable	Returned	Response rate
OPM	64	4	53	88%
NASA	437	33	340	84%
NOAA	129	17	89	80%
PTO	26	4	20	91%
Army	286	34	225	89%
DOE	583	60	413	79%
SEC	40	1	33	85%
Random Sample	520	64	381	84%
Total	2,085	217	1,554	

Sampling Error

As in any data collection effort which does not obtain responses from the entire population, the questionnaire results are subject to a certain amount of sampling error. This sampling error depends on the level of confidence sought, the number of responses, and the observed percentage responding to specific questions. Overall, had all respondents answered every question, the sampling error at the 95 percent confidence level would have been ± 4 percent if 50 percent of the participants responded a certain way and ± 2.5 percent if 20 or 80 percent of the participants responded a certain way. For example, if 50 percent of the participants responded that they had received performance appraisal training, we would be 95 percent confident that between 46 and 54 percent of the Federal senior executives received formal training. Had 20 percent of the executives responded that they had receive training, we would be 95 percent confident that between 17.5 and 22.5 percent had received training. Results would be somewhat less precise on individual questions depending on the number of actual responses to those questions.

Response rates are percentages of senior executives who responded to the question--i.e., rates are adjusted for missing responses. For example, in question A1 A, the response rates are

Categories	Number responding (weighted)	Unadjusted Frequency (%)	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Strong influence	856	16.2	16.7
Moderate influence	1,738	31.7	32.7
Minimal influence	1,927	28.6	29.5
No influence	985	14.1	14.5
Don't know	384	6.3	6.5
Missing	179	3.0	---
	6,069		

Percentages do not always add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding error.

The weighted number of executives responding to each question is also shown and appears with the notation "n=." The percentage of executives answering the questionnaire but not answering a particular question (non-adusted percent of responses missing) can be found by subtracting n from 6,069 (total weighted number responding to our questionnaire), dividing by 6,069, and multiplying the result by 100 i.e.,

$$\% \text{ missing} = (6{,}069 - n) \times 100$$

For example, in question A1 A,

$$\% \text{ missing} = \frac{(6{,}069 - 5{,}890)}{6{,}069} \times 100 - \frac{179}{6{,}069} \times 100 = 2.9\%$$

Unadjusted frequencies for each response category can be calculated by multiplying n by the response rate, dividing by 6,069, and multiplying by 100.

APPENDIX III

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Survey of Senior Executives on Performance Appraisal

Instructions

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your opinions about certain aspects of the Senior Executive Service (SES). Although the SES has been in effect for only a short time, the information you provide can help it to better serve your needs and those of the entire Government.

You may not need to answer every question. Instructions have been built into the questionnaire to branch you around questions which do not apply to you. Thus, you will see statements such as "Go To Question 7" indicating which question you should answer next.

Most of the questions can be answered by circling the number printed beside the appropriate answer. These numbers are for keypunching purposes only. For example:

1
2
3

Please circle only one answer, except where the instructions specify that you should circle all that apply.

In answering this questionnaire, please use the following definitions.

Performance appraisal system: The entire process of establishing individual performance requirements; conducting performance reviews and appraisals; recommending ratings, rewards, and other actions; and determining final performance ratings.

Your agency: The organizational unit to which you belong that is responsible for designing a distinct SES performance appraisal system. For example, bureaus in the Department of Commerce have designed eleven distinct SES performance appraisal systems under general Departmental guidelines. Consequently, if you work for the Department of Commerce, when this questionnaire refers to "your agency" it is referring to the particular bureau under which you work. However, if you work at an agency with only one SES performance appraisal system (like NASA or the Department of Energy), "your agency" is referring to the entire governmental agency to which you belong.

Performance objectives: The goals or factors against which an executive's performance will be measured at the end of an appraisal period. The term is used here to include what agencies have referred to as performance requirements, performance standards, and/or performance plans.

APPENDIX III

SECTION A SES PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN YOUR AGENCY

The purpose of this section is to obtain your views on how senior executives in your agency as a group are influenced by its SES performance appraisal system. The following section, Section B, is designed to obtain your views on the impact of your agency's performance appraisal system on you personally

Please note: Some questions in Sections A and B are similar. However, the perspectives from which you answer them will be different.

A1. Please indicate the extent to which you feel the results of SES performance appraisal will influence each of the following.

n=		Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Minimal Influence	No Influence	Don't Know
5890	A. Salary decisions	16.7	32.7	29.5	14.5	6.5
5878	B. Awarding of bonuses	47.4	25.3	17.2	5.0	5.0
5887	C. Awarding of meritorious or distinguished ranks	42.4	22.5	20.3	9.3	5.5
5855	D. Demotions	35.4	20.2	25.9	8.9	9.6
5900	E. Recommendations for training or career development	7.3	29.4	38.2	18.6	6.5
5902	F. Assignment of additional authority, responsibility or budget	7.3	25.2	39.0	23.0	5.5
5902	G. Improved office surroundings, increased personnel support, or fringe benefits	1.9	5.8	31.0	55.0	6.4

A2. In your opinion, how will your agency's SES performance appraisal system affect overall performance of your agency's senior executives?

n=5877

Percent Responding		
6.1	A.	Strong positive effect
43.4	B.	Moderate positive effect
27.0	C.	No effect
9.2	D.	Moderate negative effect
2.9	E.	Strong negative effect
11.5	F.	No opinion/Can't determine at this time

APPENDIX III

A3. In your opinion how will your agency's performance appraisal system affect overall morale of your agency's senior executives?

n=5893

Percent Responding	
3.3	Strong positive effect
23.4	Moderate positive effect
17.0	No effect
30.9	Moderate negative effect
10.1	Strong negative effect
15.3	No opinion/Can't determine at this time

A4. Do you feel your agency's Performance Review Board (PRB) serves a necessary review function in performance and award decision making?

n=5893

Percent Responding	
36.4	Yes
18.7	No
44.8	Don't know/No opinion

A5. In your opinion, how likely is it that each of the following aspects of the SES system in your agency will contribute to improved senior executive performance?

n=		Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very unlikely	No opinion don't know
5880	A. Opportunity for bonuses and meritorious or distinguished rank awards	20.2	40.3	20.1	5.9	9.9	3.6
5896	B. Requirement to set specific performance objectives	23.8	42.4	18.2	5.9	7.6	2.0
5980	C. Opportunity to receive feedback on performance	20.8	46.1	17.0	7.6	5.7	2.8
5874	D. Opportunities for salary increases	12.6	28.7	28.9	9.8	15.1	4.8
5908	E. Opportunities for executive development and sabbaticals	5.8	26.1	33.6	13.9	13.3	7.3

APPENDIX III

A-5. (Cont.)

n=		Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	No opinion/ don't know
		Percent responding					
5902 F.	Degree of support from top agency management for the performance appraisal system	19.0	34.7	22.1	8.7	7.8	7.8
5890 G.	Possibility of not receiving a bonus	13.8	26.7	26.8	12.3	15.5	4.8
5909 H.	Possibility of removal from SES for unsatisfactory performance	12.9	24.8	26.4	15.2	15.8	5.0
5908 I.	Possibility of decrease in salary or responsibility	8.9	26.1	26.1	17.1	15.6	6.2

A6. How much influence do you feel each of the following will have on SES performance ratings in your agency?

n=		Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Minimal Influence	No Influence	Don't Know
		Percent responding				
5829 A.	Individual's actual performance compared to objectives established with his or her supervisor	31.5	44.4	17.7	2.6	3.8
5851 B.	Individual's actual performance compared with established objectives, taking into consideration their difficulty and the effects of unanticipated developments	34.8	39.2	17.7	3.8	4.5
5836 C.	Years of service in the agency	4.9	18.5	38.7	32.5	5.5
5846 D.	Degree of Presidential Administration priority given to the work of the individual	20.9	23.8	18.1	19.6	17.7
5862 E.	Whether an individual is located in headquarters or the field	16.5	24.5	20.0	25.5	13.5
5875 F.	Extent of active support for EEO and affirmative action	22.5	33.2	27.7	9.9	6.6

APPENDIX III

A6. (cont.)

n=		Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Minimal Influence	No Influence	Don't Know
		Percent responding				
5826	G. Ability to obtain support from beneficiaries, critics, and overseers of work the individual is managing	20.9	38.7	22.6	10.1	7.7
5846	H. Ability to work long hours and motivate subordinates to do the same	15.4	30.8	30.3	18.0	5.5
5862	I. Ability to negotiate achievable objectives with supervisor	28.1	40.8	20.1	7.2	3.9
5841	J. Number of new program initiatives put forward during the last year	11.7	37.7	31.6	12.9	6.0
5840	K. Extent to which philosophical beliefs are in agreement with current Presidential Administration	17.6	19.4	24.6	27.6	10.8
5841	L. Individual's relationship with influential persons (e.g., mentor-protege, old-school, mutual help relationships)	25.9	26.2	18.9	22.1	6.9

SECTION B OUR PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH SES PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinions concerning your agency's performance appraisal system on you personally.

B1. Have performance objectives been established in writing for your work?

n=5857

Percent Responding	
94.0	Yes
5.4	No (Go To Question B11)
0.6	Don't know (Go To Question B11)

B2. To what extent is your performance in each of the following areas required to be included as a part of your performance objectives?

n=		Must be a critical job element	Must be included but not a critical job element	Recommended	Not Recommended
		Percent responding			
5449	A. Evaluating subordinates	23.4	31.9	16.7	28.1
5415	B. Performance coaching/ counseling of subordinates	18.8	34.5	19.3	27.4
5390	C. Professional development of subordinates	23.4	34.4	21.4	20.8
5475	D. Meeting EEO and Affirmative Action objectives	64.2	27.6	4.7	3.5

B3. To what extent were the following documents used in developing your performance objectives?

n=		Exclusively	Great extent	Moderate extent	Minimal extent	Not at all	Don't know
		Percent responding					
5535	A. Your position description	1.0	33.8	33.2	15.7	14.2	2.1
5531	B. Mission/function statements of agency and/or subagency unit(s) where you work	4.9	50.7	21.4	13.1	8.1	1.8
5492	C. Operating budget	1.2	15.7	25.8	23.9	30.2	3.1

APPENDIX III

n=		Exclusively	Great extent	Moderate extent	Minimal extent	Not at all	Don't know
		Percent responding					
5530	D. Annual agency, or subagency, work plans	4.6	40.9	21.1	14.0	16.9	2.7
1718	E. Other please specify _____	11.6	49.8	2.9	1.1	16.4	18.3

B4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your performance objectives.

		Strongly agree	Mildly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ no opinion
		Percent responding					
5548	A. Objectives are clear	57.0	34.4	3.9	2.5	2.1	0
5548	B. Objectives are job related	75.5	21.0	1.7	1.8	0	0
5547	C. Objectives cover all important aspects of your job	41.3	35.4	6.3	9.8	7.1	0.8
5520	D. Objectives are defined only in terms of how much is to be accomplished or when (i.e., quantitative results, deadlines)	17.5	30.6	16.8	19.2	15.1	0.8
5520	E. Objectives are defined in terms of the manner in which they are to be accomplished	13.4	33.4	20.2	16.7	15.6	0.8
5534	F. Concrete evidence of performance is available in those areas in which objectives have been established	29.3	39.6	11.0	13.7	5.6	0.8
5535	G. Objectives are consistent with your position description	52.2	34.6	7.9	3.2	1.4	0.6

APPENDIX III

B4. (Cont.)

n=		Strongly agree	Mildly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ no opinion
		Percent responding					
5548	H. Objectives are realistic (i.e., they could be reasonably expected of you)	54.7	3.6	5.7	3.2	1.8	0
5549	I. You have enough authority to accomplish your performance objectives	36.0	35.7	9.8	11.5	6.5	0.5
5549	J. You have enough human and material resources to accomplish your performance objectives	19.8	34.7	10.1	22.8	12.0	0.6

B5. Who determined your performance objectives? (Circle only one)

n=5549

Percent Responding	
2.5	You alone
34.4	You, subject to supervisor review
47.4	They were jointly developed, involving you and your supervisor
9.3	Your supervisor or higher authority determined them and then asked for your input
3.3	Your supervisor or higher authority determined them without your input
0.2	Don't know
2.8	Other,

B6. How much discussion was there between you and your supervisor in setting your performance objectives?

n=5567

Percent Responding	
8.2	None, but I didn't need any
7.4	None, although I wanted some
23.3	Some, but not as much as needed
5.3	A lot, but not as much as needed
55.6	As much as needed

B7. How difficult was it to develop your performance objectives?

n=5523

Percent Responding	
13.3	Very difficult
41.7	Somewhat difficult
26.4	Neither difficult nor easy
10.8	Somewhat easy
7.7	Very easy

B8. In general, to what extent have performance levels been specifically defined for your objectives? (i.e., defining what constitutes outstanding performance, excellent, fully successful, etc.)

n=5526

Percent Responding	
5.8	Completely
18.6	Great extent
29.9	Moderate extent
23.6	Minimal extent
22.2	Not at all

B9. To what extent did your supervisor change what you thought should be your performance objectives?

n=5501

Percent Responding	
3.6	Greatly changed
19.4	Moderately changed
44.8	Minimally changed
28.5	Did not change
0.3	My supervisor has not seen them

B10. To what extent do you agree with your supervisor's changes to what you thought should be your objectives?

n=5337

Percent Responding	
16.7	Strongly agree
33.2	Moderately agree
12.3	Neither agree nor disagree
8.4	Moderately disagree
1.9	Strongly disagree
23.5	Objectives were not changed
3.7	Supervisor is still reviewing objectives
0.3	Supervisor has not seen them

B11. Do you have sufficient appeal alternatives if you disagree with your performance objectives?

n=5832

Percent Responding	
39.8	Yes
15.5	No
9.2	No opinion
35.5	Don't know

B12. How long is your first performance appraisal period under SES?

n=5653

Percent Responding	
3.3	3 months
6.0	4 months
32.8	6 months
35.2	12 months
11.1	Other, please specify _____.
5.3	Hasn't been determined yet
6.5	Don't know

B13. During what month and year did (or will) your first SES performance rating period start?

_____ (Month) _____ (Year)

n=5325

Percent responding

Mo/Yr	%	Mo/Yr	%	Mo/Yr	%
3/79 -	0.2	11/79 -	2.9	7/80 -	3.8
4/79 -	0.1	12/79 -	2.2	8/80 -	1.0
5/79 -	0.2	1/80 -	7.8	9/80 -	0.8
6/79 -	0.6	2/80 -	2.2	10/80 -	3.9
7/79 -	9.5	3/80 -	3.3	11/80 -	0.3
8/79 -	0.5	4/80 -	8.4	12/80 -	0.1
9/79 -	2.7	5/80 -	5.3	1/81 -	0.2
10/79 -	38.5	6/80 -	4.5	6/81 -	0.2

B14. How long will your subsequent performance rating periods be under SES?

n=5721

Percent Responding	
2.2	3 months
.0	4 months
7.9	6 months
74.1	12 months
0.7	Other, please specify _____.
3.0	Hasn't been determined yet
12.0	Don't know

B15. In your opinion, how will your agency's performance appraisal system affect your overall performance?

n= 5892

Percent Responding	
6.9	Strong positive effect
37.1	Moderate positive effect
36.7	No effect
7.3	Moderate negative effect
2.5	Strong negative effect
9.5	No opinion/Can't determine at this time

B16. How likely is it that each of the following aspects of the SES system in your agency will motivate you?

n=		Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	No opinion/ don't know
		Percent responding					
5869	A. Opportunity for bonuses, meritorious or distinguished rank awards	24.7	30.7	20.4	5.5	17.2	1.5
5873	B. Requirement to set specific performance objectives	19.4	35.6	23.0	5.4	15.9	0.6
5881	C. Opportunity to receive feedback on performance	19.9	41.1	22.7	5.2	10.1	1.1
5830	D. Opportunities for salary increases	17.4	26.4	23.1	7.8	22.4	3.0
5874	E. Opportunities for executive development and sabbaticals	11.9	17.3	32.5	10.1	25.1	3.1
5881	F. Level of support from your supervisor for the performance appraisal system	17.9	31.2	24.9	8.0	15.4	2.6
5854	G. Possibility of not receiving bonuses	13.6	18.0	28.6	12.1	25.0	2.6
5882	H. Possibility of removal from SES for unsatisfactory performance	10.9	15.2	28.8	12.0	30.4	2.7
5870	I. Possibility of a decrease in salary or responsibility	11.0	14.6	28.2	13.2	30.5	2.5

APPENDIX III

B17. In your opinion, how will your agency's performance appraisal system affect your overall morale?

n=5826

Percent Responding	
5.3	Strong positive effect
26.3	Moderate positive effect
22.9	No effect
20.7	Moderate negative effect
8.2	Strong negative effect
16.6	No opinion/Can't determine at this time

B18. To what extent do the following support your agency's SES performance appraisal system?

n=		Strongly support	Mildly support	Indifferent	Mildly against	Strongly against	Don't know/ no opinion
		Percent responding					
5831	A. The top few executives in the agency	36.6	28.6	11.8	1.7	4.2	17.1
5894	B. Senior executives as a whole	13.0	35.7	18.2	13.3	7.6	12.1
5833	C. Yourself	28.6	33.9	16.8	10.8	7.2	2.8

B19. How difficult do you believe your agency's SES performance appraisal system is to use?

n=5784

Percent Responding	
17.5	Very difficult
45.9	Somewhat difficult
28.1	Neither difficult nor easy
5.9	Somewhat easy
2.6	Very easy

B20. How much control do you believe your immediate supervisor has over the bonus you may receive?

n=5861

Percent Responding	
15.4	If he/she recommends me for a bonus I'll almost always receive it in the amount recommended
16.9	If he/she recommends me for a bonus I'll almost always receive it but not necessarily in the amount recommended
27.6	If he/she recommends me for a bonus I will not necessarily receive one
11.2	My supervisor will not be allowed to specifically recommend a bonus for me, he can recommend a rating only
3.6	I'm not eligible for bonuses
17.3	Don't know
7.9	Not determined at this time

B21. To what extent did you participate in the development of your agency's SES performance appraisal system?

n=5897

Percent Responding	
8.2	Great extent
13.8	Moderate extent
12.7	Some extent
16.9	Minimal extent
47.7	No extent
0.8	Don't know

APPENDIX III

SECTION C SUPERVISION

C1. To how many SES employees will you personnally be giving performance appraisals?

n=5890

Percent Responding	
67.8	None (Go to Section D)
8.9	1
6.1	2
9.8	3-5
4.3	6-9
3.1	10 or more

C2. How were the performance objectives developed for each of your subordinates?

n=1964

Percent Responding	
0.2	You determined them
4.8	You determined them, with subsequent review from your subordinates
23.2	The subordinates determined them, subject to your review
59.0	You determined them jointly with your subordinates
3.0	Your supervisor or higher authority determined them with your input
0.1	Your supervisor or higher authority determined them without your input
1.4	Don't know
4.3	Other, please specify _____ _____.
3.5	Performance objectives for my subordinates have not been determined yet

APPENDIX III

C3. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your subordinates' performance objectives.

n=		Strongly agree	Mildly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion/ don't know
		Percent responding					
1880	A. Objectives have been made clear to your subordinates	53.3	41.5	2.2	1.0	0.8	1.0
1878	B. Objectives are job related	74.7	21.3	1.5	0.8	0.7	0.9
1881	C. Objectives cover all important aspects of the job	43.3	36.4	8.5	6.5	4.3	1.0
1881	D. Objectives are realistic	50.8	42.0	5.1	0.5	0.7	1.0
1877	E. Objectives are defined only in terms of how much is to be accomplished, or when (i.e., quantitative results, deadlines, etc.)	11.7	34.9	18.7	15.5	18.3	0.9
1866	F. Objectives are defined in terms of the manner in which they are to be accomplished	11.1	33.9	22.2	18.1	13.6	1.1
1878	G. I have enough authority to oversee, control and assist my subordinates in meeting their objectives	39.4	40.1	7.8	7.8	4.1	0.8

APPENDIX III

C4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your subordinates' performance appraisals.

n=		Strongly agree	Mildly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion/ don't know
		Percent responding					
1884	A. I have frequent opportunities to observe the relevant actions and their outcomes on which I appraise my subordinates	70.7	23.4	2.9	2.1	0.6	0.2
1884	B. Actions or outcomes on which subordinates are appraised are consistent with their position descriptions	59.5	32.7	4.3	0.8	1.0	1.7
1861	C. Performance is assessed on concrete evidence	34.8	45.8	12.1	6.3	0.1	0.9

C5 Before SES, how important did you consider performance appraisal with your senior executive subordinates? (i.e., setting performance objectives, reviewing progress towards them, appraising results, etc.)

n=1915

Percent Responding	
4.3	More important than any other function
42.2	Very important, a major responsibility
34.7	Somewhat important
11.9	Not very important
2.9	Unimportant
4.0	Did not supervise executives before SES

APPENDIX III

C6. Now with SES, how important do you consider performance appraisal with your senior executive subordinates?

n=1915

Percent Responding	
8.3	More important than any other function
64.7	Very important, a major responsibility
18.1	Somewhat important
8.8	Not very important
0.1	Unimportant

C7. How much control do you have over the bonus each of your subordinates may receive?

n=1920

Percent Responding	
7.3	If I recommend a bonus he/she will almost always receive it in the amount recommended
17.3	If I recommend a bonus he/she will almost always receive one but not necessarily in the amount recommended
29.6	If I recommend a bonus he/she will not necessarily receive one
11.7	I am not allowed to recommend bonuses for my subordinate(s); I can recommend a rating only
21.8	Don't know
11.4	Not determined at this time
0.9	I do not supervise SES members eligible for bonuses

APPENDIX III

SECTION D TRAINING

D1. Have you received any type of training or formal briefing concerning performance appraisal under SES in your agency?

n= 5905

Percent Responding	
12.0	No (Go To Question D3)
88.0	Yes (Continue To Question D2)

D2. How long did this training last?

n= 5191

Percent Responding	
1.7	Less than 1 hour
18.9	1 to 4 hours
30.8	More than 4 hours but no more than 1 day
21.8	More than 1 day but no more than 2 days
19.2	More than 2 days but no more than 3 days
7.7	More than 3 days

D3. To what extent would you like to receive additional training in the following subjects?

n=		Great extent	Moderate extent	Some extent	Minimal extent	No extent	Not applicable
		Percent responding					
5821	Setting performance objectives	11.4	16.2	18.1	12.9	40.9	0.6
5832	Appraising subordinates (e.g. How to eliminate bias, etc.)	13.3	17.7	15.1	12.6	36.5	4.8
5824	Counseling/coaching subordinates (interpersonal communications, establishing rapport etc.)	12.9	19.8	16.3	12.7	34.2	4.1

D4. For remainder of fiscal year 1980, will you receive SES performance appraisal training?

n= 5854

Percent Responding	
7.8	Yes (Continue To D5)
70.0	No (Go To Question D6)
22.1	Don't know (Go To Question D6)

D5. How long will your SES performance appraisal training last?

n= 616

Percent Responding	
2.8	Less than 1 hour
19.8	1 to 4 hours
10.5	More than 4 hours but no more than 1 day
22.3	More than 1 day but no more than 2 days
5.1	More than 2 days but no more than 3 days
2.4	More than 3 days
37.2	I don't know at this time

D6. How satisfied are you with your current level of knowledge about your agency's SES performance appraisal system?

n= 5824

Percent Responding	
25.9	Very satisfied
32.3	Somewhat satisfied
22.8	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
13.9	Somewhat dissatisfied
5.2	Very dissatisfied

APPENDIX III

D7. How difficult was it to develop your performance objectives?

n=5523

Percent Responding	
13.3	Very difficult
41.7	Somewhat difficult
26.4	Neither difficult nor easy
10.8	Somewhat easy
7.7	Very easy

D8. In general, to what extent have performance levels been specifically defined for your objectives? (i.e., defining what constitutes outstanding performance, excellent, fully successful, etc.)

n=5526

Percent Responding	
5.8	Completely
18.6	Great extent
29.9	Moderate extent
23.6	Minimal extent
22.2	Not at all

D9. To what extent did your supervisor change what you thought should be your performance objectives?

n=5501

Percent Responding	
3.6	Greatly changed
19.4	Moderately changed
44.8	Minimally changed
28.5	Did not change
3.4	My supervisor is still reviewing them
0.3	My supervisor has not seen them

APPENDIX III

SECTION E DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The following information is for statistical classification purposes only. All of your responses are strictly confidential.

E1. Where are you presently assigned?

n=5926

Percent Responding	
66.6	Headquarters within Washington D.C. metropolitan area
3.4	Headquarters outside Washington D.C. metropolitan area
4.2	Field location within Washington D.C. metropolitan area
25.8	Field location outside Washington D.C. metroplitan area

E2. Which type of SES appointment do you have?

n=5885

Percent Responding	
91.2	Career
8.7	Non-career
0.0	Limited term
0.1	Limited emergency

E3. What is your current pay grade?

n= 5775

Percent Responding	
6.3	Executive Service I
7.8	Executive Service II
8.6	Executive Service III
64.8	Executive Service IV
8.8	Executive Service V
3.6	Executive Service VI

APPENDIX III

E4. Excluding military service, how many years have you been employed by the Federal Government?

_____ years

n=5924

Percent Responding	
0.0	Less than 1 year
7.0	1-3 years
10.5	4-8 years
20.2	9-15 years
62.2	More than 15 years

E5. Before joining the Senior Executive Service, how many years experience did you have at the GS-16 level or above?

n=5908

Percent Responding	
13.7	None
9.8	Less than 1 year
24.1	1-3 years
31.7	4-8 years
15.8	9-15 years
5.0	More than 15 years

E6. How many years have you worked in your present agency?

n=5914

Percent Responding	
3.9	Less than 1 year
17.5	1-3 years
15.5	4-8 years
19.7	9-15 years
43.4	More than 15 years

APPENDIX III

E7. How many years of professional experience have you had in the private sector?

n=5929

Percent Responding	
30.5	None
6.4	Less than 1 year
20.0	1-3 years
20.0	4-8 years
14.3	9-15 years
8.6	More than 15 years

E8. Are you?

n=5844

Percent Responding	
1.9	American Indian
0.0	Eskimo (Alaska)
0.0	Aleut (Alaska)
0.9	Asian or Pacific Islander
2.3	Black
93.6	White
1.3	Other

E.9 Are you?

n=5887

Percent Responding	
95.2	Male
4.8	Female

E10. Are you of Hispanic origin?

n=5775

Percent Responding	
1.1	Yes
98.9	No

E11. Which of the following describe your present supervisor?

n= 5881

Percent Responding	
9.3	Military
25.3	Political appointee
63.7	Senior Executive Service
1.7	Other, please specify

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1981 341-845/733

SECTION F EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

Questions in this section, which were part of another GAO review, were not related to performance appraisal and are not included in this report. They were included in the questionnaire to avoid sending two questionnaires to senior executives.

SECTION G CONCLUSION

Please add any comments you have concerning your SES performance appraisal or executive development systems and any problems you have experienced or foresee in their implementation and use.

	Percent
No response	47.6
Wrote a comment	52.4 (n=3177)

(961113)